The secret of man's being is not only to live but to have something to live *for*.
—DOSTOEVSKI

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 53 OCTOBER, 1965 NUMBER 12

EGOIC BECOMING

How shall we be proud when we are so small? How dare we be humble when we are so great? —JASPER NIEMAND

SELF-REALIZATION is in large part a resolution of polarities or "pairs of opposites" by reaching to their synthesis in a higher state of consciousness, where the dilemmas or conflicts of difference no longer have any reality. The man who is ordinarily hampered by a sense of his own limitations loses his feelings of inhibition and inadequacy at times when he is doing his very best in some cooperative enterprise. The basis of comparing himself with others dissolves in the fullness of his effort while working with others toward a common end. He finds that what previously bothered him *no longer matters*. He still is what he is—or rather, what he was in the world of static contrasts and relativities—but he no longer lives in that world. Now his attention is wholly involved in the world of becoming, and he feels at one with all the "becoming" processes there are. This is enough for him, as for all so engaged.

He has, you could say, become "impersonal." He has attained a condition which supervenes whenever the ego goes about its appointed tasks. No longer is he busy measuring himself against some standard which makes him feel small or insignificant. A rational or intellectual counterpart of his original situation would be found in the observation of a child who weeps because he cannot do what older children can do, or rejoices in his elevation over the younger ones. How ridiculous! you say. Can't he *see* that *everyone* is in this

situation! But he can't see this so long as he frames the scope of his being by the limited scale of a small, personal environment. To be, for him, has no meaning in itself. Only to be more, or less, excites a feeling of reality. And only when he stops thinking of himself in these terms can he gain that freedom from comparison which comes from the universal solvent of action. The genius or skill of a teacher is apparent when he helps the child forget himself by becoming involved in thinking.

What is "the Path"? A human being enters the path when he undertakes to teach himself what heretofore he has waited to learn, on separate and limited occasions, from others. As *Light on the Path* says:

> The whole nature of man must be used wisely by the one who desires to enter the way. Each man is to himself absolutely the way, the truth, and the life. But he is only so when he grasps his whole individuality firmly, and, by the force of his awakened spiritual will, recognizes this individuality [personality] as not himself, but that thing which he has with pain created for his own use, and by means of which he purposes, as his growth slowly develops his intelligence, to reach to the life beyond individuality.

There is of course a price to pay. Somehow, by an inward transvaluation of ends, he has to stop *caring* about his personal status. This is called, in the Great Tradition, the death of selfishness. But it is also called the second birth. On one side of the ledger the cost of rebirth is referred to as "sacrifice," but on the other it is known as "freedom," or perhaps "self-actualization"—to borrow from the humanistic psychologists. And you could argue that so long as the individual *feels* the deprivation of sacrifice, he is still role-playing from the egoic point of view. Yet the metaphors of self-denial and confinement have to be used if the idea of achievement is to get through to the personal consciousness. Otherwise, every time the role-playing element in the individual gets to feeling good, he will imagine that he has won some spiritual status for himself.

So, there is a price to pay; but, paradoxically, the asking price is not the price that is paid. For once paid, it is no price, but the liberation which comes at a higher level of awareness. Basic honesty is required to see this. For one who has learned the doctrine, and regards himself as a serious searcher for truth, there is no way of avoiding the admission that the only thing that stands between him and liberation is a disinclination to accept it.

A great deal of illumination comes with this admission. For example, one begins to see that knowing the doctrine is not the same as *taking the step*. Meanwhile, some people with very poor or fragmentary doctrines bear themselves through life with integrity and strength. Their words may be contradictory, their ideals circumscribed, but they have some of the mien, some of the synthesis of opposites, for which we long. Not knowing the doctrine, they are not *supposed* to have the achievement; and there may be a sense in which they don't; but there is another sense (unknown in essence to us) in which they do, and unless this is recognized and honored, the would-be disciple may indulge a personal tendency to comparisons. This is another form of role-playing, and it is odious to the soul.

Here, once more, is the problem of the frames of being. For the ego, the path which is a conscious movement toward initiation and liberation from personality is a work of continous becoming, and while the "becoming" proceeds, no personal comparisons can gain reality from feeling. But when the becoming is not going on, the framing idea of the "path" turns into sectarian status, and the ugly round of comparisons begins again.

In addition to the price to be paid, there are time-honored methods to be pursued and rules rooted in wisdom to be observed. Methods, when followed, bring confrontations and inescapable choice. If the methods are not used, the confrontations, if they come at all, occur obscurely or in deceptive forms. The methods have for their purpose the clearing away of obstacles to perception, and the presentation of graded realities in their natural symmetry. When choices are symmetrically framed, the lessons learned from the symbol lives of great teachers have clear application. It often happens, therefore, that one who fails to use the methods will say to himself, "I am different, my case is unique," and he will not recognize the true confrontations and he will feel free to change the rules as he imagines they ought to apply to *him*.

The methods have to do with the discovery of true identity. They prepare the way for an awakening to the Self. They are an invitation —not a training—of the spiritual will. They are a means of learning to recognize where one is, at any given moment, on the great scale of awareness. They are a means of experiencing the greatest reality on the plane of the highest abstraction. They are a means of establishing the tropism of the one for the One.

The rules are a way of importing the remembered reality of the higher life into the conditions of personal existence. Unless that reality *is* remembered, the rules are but prohibitions and directions. But as it is remembered, they become finite reflections of the flow of the inner being. Instead of stern injunctions, they are familiar landmarks of ways well known to the soul. Arbitrariness is not of their essence, but of their form, and they are made in the service of a sight which, when focused in the personal man, can recognize naught but form.

All the "practices" of the personal man who longs—or tries to long—for liberation are stimuli for remembering the quality of the spiritual life. They have undeniable and necessary use at the personal level of being, but can easily become a "system" of devices which is mistaken for the process of becoming, when the role-playing tendency replaces the act of becoming. So, rejection of the personal pronoun is a handy device for reminding oneself of the impersonality of spirit, but it can also be an announcement of status when labored over with what verges on ostentation. A person could make a sentence which needs no pronoun at all, with a little forethought and effort of mind. To say "we" for "I," in some contexts, is to fly pennants of spiritual commitment. And to insist upon "I," in reaction to the "unnatural," plural, could be another sort of self-advertisement. These are not issues, but matters having to do with the different devices suitable for remembering the importance of impersonality, as individuals and as communities of students. The principle is that while the devices are necessary and born of a wise tradition, they are not themselves what they are used to represent. When devices are mistaken for impersonality, they become personal and a form of role-playing.

A form made for use on any plane of consciousness and relationships needs to be conceived out of regard for the kind of becoming and the kind of decisions that belong to that plane. There are forms which must be made entirely by ourselves, and forms which embody the wisdom of those with long experience of different sorts of group relationships. The interplay of daring originality with faithfulness and following the "lines laid down" is governed by inward perception of the fitness of things and by that integrity of heart which opens the disciple's mind and feelings to the several needs of egoic becoming.

HERETICS AND THE RENAISSANCE

IX—In the Light of Theosophy

HISTORY finds the first Christian sects to have been either Nazarenes like John the Baptist; or Ebionites, among whom were many of the relatives of Jesus; or Essenes (Iessaens) the Therapeutæ, healers, of which the Nazaria were a branch. All these sects, which only in the days of Irenæus began to be considered heretical, were more or less kabalistic (p. 127). So hopelessly entangled seems Irenæus in his fruitless endeavors to describe, to all outward appearance at least, the true doctrines of the many Gnostic sects of which he treats and to present them at the same time as abominable "heresies," that he either deliberately, or through ignorance, confounds all of them in such a way that few metaphysicians would be able to disentangle them, without the *Kabala* and the *Codex* as the true keys (p. 176).

Later, when all these extraordinary blunders, contradictions, dissensions and inventions were forcibly crammed into a frame elaborately executed by the episcopal caste of the new religion, and called Christianity; and the chaotic picture itself cunningly preserved from too close scrutiny by a wide array of formidable Church penances and anathemas, which kept the curious back under the false pretense of sacrilege and profanation of divine mysteries; and millions of people had been butchered in the name of the God of mercy—then came the Reformation. It certainly deserves its name in its fullest paradoxical sense. It abandoned Peter and alleges to have chosen Paul for its only leader. And the apostle who thundered against the old law of bondage; who left full liberty to Christians to either observe the Sabbath or set it aside; who rejects everything anterior to John the Baptist, is now the professed standard bearer of Protestantism, which holds to the *old* law more than the Jews, imprisons those who view the Sabbath as Jesus and Paul did, and outvies the synagogue of the first century in dogmatic intolerance!

But who then *were* the first Christians, may still be asked? Doubtless the Ebionites; and in this we follow the authority of the best

---

Note.—All material in this installment is from *Isis Unveiled,* Vol. II.

critics. "There can be little doubt that the author (of the *Clementine Homilies*) was a representative of Ebionitic Gnosticism, which *had once been the purest form of primitive Christianity . . .*" And who were the Ebionites? The pupils and followers of the early Nazarenes, the kabalistic Gnostics. Renan shows the Ebionites numbering among their sect all the surviving relatives of Jesus. John the Baptist, his cousin and *precursor,* was the accepted Saviour of the Nazarenes, and their prophet. His disciples dwelt on the other side of the Jordan, and the scene of the baptism of the Jordan is clearly and beyond any question proved by the author of *Sod, the Son of the Man,* to have been the site of the Adonis-worship. "Having been united (conjunctus) to the Nazarenes, each (Ebionite) imparted to the other out of his own wickedness, and decided that Christ *was of the seed of a man,*" writes Epiphanius. And if they did, we must suppose they knew more about their contemporary prophet than Epiphanius 400 years later. Theodoret, as shown elsewhere, describes the Nazarenes as Jews who "honor the Anointed as a just man," and use the *evangel* called *"According to Peter."* Jerome finds the authentic and original *evangel,* written in Hebrew, by Matthew the apostle-publican, in the library collected at Cæsarea, by the martyr Pamphilius. *"I received permission from the Nazarenes,* who at Berœa of Syria used this (gospel) to translate it," he writes toward the end of the fourth century. "In the *evangel* which the *Nazarenes* and *Ebionites* use," adds Jerome, "which recently I translated from Hebrew into Greek, and which is called by most persons the *genuine Gospel of Matthew,*" etc.

Jerome adds that it was written in the Chaldaic language, but with Hebrew letters. The Ebionites, the *genuine* primitive Christians, rejecting the rest of the apostolic writings, made use only of this Gospel, and the Ebionites, as Epiphanius declares, firmly believed, with the Nazarenes, that Jesus was but a man "of the seed of a man." Jerome knew that this *original Gospel of Matthew* was the expounder of the only true doctrine of Christ; and that it was the work of an evangelist who had been a friend and companion of Jesus. He knew that if of the two *Gospels,* the Hebrew in question and the Greek belonging to our present Scripture, one was spurious, hence heretical, it was not that of the Nazarenes; and yet, knowing all this, Jerome becomes more zealous than ever in his persecutions of the "Hæretics." Why? Because to accept it was equivalent to reading the death-sentence of the established Church. The *Gospel accord-*

ing to the Hebrews was but too well known to have been the only one accepted for four centuries by the Jewish Christians, the Nazarenes and the Ebionites. (Pp. 180-83.)

Why wonder at the unfathomable mysteries of the Christian religion, since it is perfectly *human?* Have we not a letter written by one of the most respected Fathers of the Church to this same Jerome, which shows better than whole volumes their traditionary policy? This is what *Saint* Gregory of Nazianzen wrote to his friend and confidant *Saint* Jerome: "Nothing can impose better on a people than *verbiage;* the less they understand the more they admire. Our fathers and doctors have often said, not what they thought, but what circumstances and necessity forced them to." (P. 183.)

If we now recall the fact that a portion of the Mysteries of the "Pagans" consisted of the *aporrheta,* or secret discourses; that the secret *Logia* or discourses of Jesus contained in the original *Gospel according to Matthew,* the meaning and interpretation of which St. Jerome confessed to be "a difficult task" for him to achieve, were of the same nature; and if we remember, further, that to some of the interior or final Mysteries only a very select few were admitted; and that finally it was from the number of the latter that were taken all the ministers of the holy "Pagan" rites, we will then clearly understand this expression of Jesus quoted by Peter: *"Guard the Mysteries for me and the sons of my house," i.e.,* of my doctrine. And, if we understand it rightly, we cannot avoid thinking that this "secret" doctrine of Jesus, even the technical expressions of which are but so many duplications of the Gnostic and Neoplatonic mystic phraseology—that this doctrine, we say, was based on the same transcendental philosophy of Oriental *Gnosis* as the rest of the religions of those and earliest days. That none of the later Christian sects, despite their boasting, were the inheritors of it, is evident from the contradictions, blunders, and clumsy repatching of the mistakes of every preceding century by the discoveries of the succeeding one. (Pp. 191-2).

Eusebius states that before the siege of Jerusalem the small Christian community—comprising members of whom many, if not all, knew Jesus and his apostles personally—took refuge in the little town of Pella, on the opposite shore of the Jordan. Surely these simple people, separated for centuries from the rest of the world, ought to have preserved their traditions fresher than any other nations! It is in Palestine that we have to search for the *clearest* waters

of Christianity, let alone its source. The first Christians, after the death of Jesus, all joined together for a time, whether they were Ebionites, Nazarenes, Gnostics or others. They had no Christian dogmas in those days, and their Christianity consisted in believing Jesus to be a prophet, this belief varying from seeing in him simply a "just man," or a holy, inspired prophet, a vehicle used by Christos and Sophia to manifest themselves through. These all united together in opposition to the synagogue and the tyrannical technicalities of the Pharisees, until the primitive group separated in two distinct branches—which, we may correctly term the Christian kabalists of the Jewish Tanaïm school, and the Christian kabalists of the Platonic Gnosis. The former were represented by the party composed of the followers of Peter, and John, the author of the *Apocalypse;* the latter ranged with the Pauline Christianity, blending itself, at the end of the second century, with the Platonic philosophy, and engulfing, still later, the Gnostic sects, whose symbols and misunderstood mysticism overflowed the Church of Rome. (Pp. 197-8.)

The oldest Nazarenes, who were the descendants of the Scripture *nazars,* and whose last prominent leader was John the Baptist, although never very orthodox in the sight of the scribes and Pharisees of Jerusalem were, nevertheless, respected and left unmolested. Even Herod "feared the multitude" because they regarded John as a prophet (*Matthew* xiv. 5). But the followers of Jesus evidently adhered to a sect which became a still more exasperating thorn in their side. It appeared as a heresy *within* another heresy; for while the nazars of the olden times, the "Sons of the Prophets," were Chaldean kabalists, the adepts of the new dissenting sect showed themselves reformers and innovators from the first. The great similitude traced by some critics between the rites and observances of the earliest Christians and those of the Essenes may be accounted for without the slightest difficulty. The Essenes, as we remarked just now, were the converts of Buddhist missionaries who had overrun Egypt, Greece, and even Judea at one time, since the reign of Asoka the zealous propagandist; and while it is evidently to the Essenes that belongs the honor of having had the Nazarene reformer, Jesus, as a pupil, still the latter is found disagreeing with his early teachers on several questions of formal observance. He cannot strictly be called an Essene, for reasons which we will indicate further on, neither was he a nazar, or Nazaria of the older sect. He is the founder of the sect of the new nazars, a follower of the Buddhist doctrine. The

Nazarene reformer had undoubtedly belonged to one of these sects; though, perhaps, it would be next to impossible to decide absolutely which. But what is self-evident is that he preached the philosophy of Buddha-Sakyamûni. The motive of Jesus was evidently like that of Gautama-Buddha, to benefit humanity at large by producing a religious reform which should give it a religion of pure ethics; the true knowledge of God and nature having remained until then solely in the hands of the esoteric sects, and their adepts. (Pp. 132-3.)

Not only did the Buddhist missionaries make their way to the Mesopotamian Valley, but they even went so far west as Ireland. Mr. Charles Sotheran remarked, in a lecture before the American Philological Society, that both legends and archæological remains unite in proving beyond question "that Ireland, like every other nation, once listened to the propagandists of Siddhârtha-Buddha." Buddhist missionaries, Pliny tells us, established themselves on the shores of the Dead Sea, ages before his time, *"per sæculorum millia."* (Fn. 290-91; p. 130.)

Buddhism is but the primitive source of Brahmanism. We need not be surprised, therefore, to find again, in all the fundamental dogmas of the Gnostics, the metaphysical tenets of both Brahmanism and Buddhism. They held that the *Old Testament* was the revelation of an inferior being, a subordinate divinity, and did not contain a single sentence of their *Sophia,* the Divine Wisdom. As to the *New Testament,* it had lost its purity when the compilers became guilty of interpolations. The revelation of divine truth was sacrificed by them to promote selfish ends and maintain quarrels. (P. 169.)

By Buddhism we mean that religion signifying literally the doctrine of wisdom, and which by many ages antedates the metaphysical philosophy of Siddhârtha Sakyamuni (p. 143).

We can assert, with entire plausibility, that there is not one of all these sects—Kabalism, Judaism, and our present Christianity included—but sprung from the two main branches of that one mother-trunk, the once universal religion, which antedated the Vedic ages —we speak of that prehistoric Buddhism which later merged into Brahmanism (p. 123).

We do not mean to take upon ourselves to defend the sects which inundated Europe at the eleventh century, and which brought to light the most wonderful creeds; we limit our defense merely to those Christian sects whose theories were usually grouped under

the generic name of *Gnosticism.* These are those which appeared immediately after the alleged crucifixion, and lasted till they were nearly exterminated under the rigorous execution of the Constantinian law (p. 326).

One by one the tide of time engulfed the sects of the early centuries until of the whole number only one survived in its primitive integrity. That one still exists, still teaches the doctrine of its founder, still exemplifies its faith in works of power. Driven from their native land, its members found refuge in Persia, and today the anxious traveller may converse with the direct descendants of the "Disciples of John," who listened, on the Jordan's shore, to the "man sent from God," and were baptized and believed. This curious people, numbering 30,000 or more, are miscalled "Christians of St. John," but in fact should be known by their old name of Nazareans or their new one of Mendæans. To term them Christians, is wholly unwarranted. They neither believe in Jesus as Christ, nor accept his atonement, nor adhere to his Church, nor revere its "Holy Scriptures." Neither do they worship the Jehovah-God of the Jews and Christians. (P. 289-90.) The true, original Christianity, such as was preached by Jesus, is to be found only in the so-called Syrian heresies. Only from them can we extract any clear notions about what was primitive Christianity (p. 137).

The question is likely to be asked: "In the view of so much evidence to show that Christian theology is only a *pot-pourri* of Pagan mythologies, how can it be connected with the religion of Moses?" The early Christians, Paul and his disciples, the Gnostics and their successors generally, regarded Christianity and Judaism as essentially distinct. The latter, in their view, was an antagonistic system, and from a lower origin. "Ye received the law," said Stephen, "from the ministration of angels," or æons, and not from the Most High Himself. The Gnostics taught that Jehovah, the Deity of the Jews, was Ilda Baoth, the son of the ancient *Bohu,* or Chaos, the adversary of Divine Wisdom. The question may be more than easily answered. The *law of Moses, and the so-called monotheism of the Jews, can hardly be said to have been more than two or three centuries older than Christianity.* The *Pentateuch* itself, we are able to show, was written and revised upon this "new departure," at a period subsequent to the colonization of Judea under the authority of the kings of Persia. The Christian Fathers, in their eagerness to make their new system dovetail with Judaism, and so avoid Pagan-

ism, unconsciously shunned Scylla only to be caught in the whirlpool of Charybdis. Under the monotheistic stucco of Judaism was unearthed the same familiar mythology of Paganism. The Christian world has been in a state of convulsion from the first to the present century; it has been cleft into thousands of sects; but the Jews remain substantially united. Even their differences of opinion do not destroy their unity. The Christian virtues inculcated by Jesus in the sermon on the mount are nowhere exemplified in the Christian world. The Buddhist ascetics and Indian fakirs seem almost the only ones that inculcate and practice them. Meanwhile the vices which coarse-mouthed slanderers have attributed to Paganism, are current everywhere among Christian Fathers and Christian Churches.

The boasted wide gap between Christianity and Judaism, that is claimed on the authority of Paul, exists but in the imagination of the pious. We are nought but the inheritors of the intolerant Israelites of ancient days; not the Hebrews of the time of Herod and the Roman dominion, who, with all their faults, kept strictly orthodox and monotheistic, but the Jews who, under the name of Jehovah-Nissi, worshipped Bacchus-Osiris, Dio-Nysos, the multiform Jove of Nyssa, the Sinai of Moses. The kabalistic demons—allegories of the profoundest meaning—were adopted as objective entities, and a Satanic hierarchy carefully drawn by the orthodox demonologists. (Pp. 525-526.)

And so above, below, outside, and inside, the Christian Church, in the priestly garments, and the religious rites, we recognize the stamp of exoteric heathenism. On no subject within the wide range of human knowledge, has the world been more blinded or deceived with such persistent misrepresentation as on that of antiquity. Its hoary past and its religious faiths have been misrepresented and trampled under the feet of its successors. Its hierophants and prophets, mystæ and epoptæ, of the once sacred adyta of the temple shown as demoniacs and devil-worshippers. Donned in the despoiled garments of the victim, the Christian priest now anathematizes the latter with rites and ceremonies which he has learned from the theurgists themselves. The Mosaic *Bible* is used as a weapon against the people who furnished it. The heathen philosopher is cursed under the very roof which has witnessed his initiation; and the "monkey of God" (i.e., the devil of Tertullian), "the originator and founder of magical theurgy, the science of illusions and lies, whose father

and author is the demon," is exorcised with holy water by the hand which holds the identical *lituus* (the augur's, and now bishop's, pastoral crook) with which the ancient augur, after a solemn prayer, used to determine the regions of heaven, and evoke, in the name of the HIGHEST, the minor god (now termed the Devil), who unveiled to his eyes futurity, and enabled him to prophesy! On the part of the Christians and the clergy it is nothing but shameful ignorance, prejudice, and that contemptible pride so boldly denounced by one of their own revered ministers, T. Gross, which rails against all investigation "as a useless or a criminal labor, when it must be feared that they will result in the overthrow of preëstablished systems of faith." On the part of the scholars it is the same apprehension of the possible necessity of having to modify some of their erroneously-established theories of science. "Nothing but such pitiable prejudice," says Gross, "can have thus misrepresented the theology of heathenism, and distorted—nay, caricatured—its forms of religious worship. It is time that posterity should raise its voice in vindication of violated truth, and that the present age should learn a little of that common sense of which it boasts with as much self-complacency as if the prerogative of reason was the birthright only of modern times." All this gives a sure clue to the real cause of the hatred felt by the early mediæval Christian toward his Pagan brother and dangerous rival. (Pp. 96-7.)

Had not the Christians burdened themselves with the *Revelations* of a little nation, and accepted the Jehovah of Moses, the Gnostic ideas would never have been termed *heresies;* once relieved of their dogmatic exaggerations the world would have had a religious system based on pure Platonic philosophy, and surely something would then have been gained. (P. 155.)

TWO FORMS OF RELIGION

A religion which rests upon particular conclusions in astronomy, biology, and history may be fatally injured by the discovery of new truths. But the religion of the spirit does not depend upon creeds and cosmologies; it has no vested interest in any particular truth. It is concerned not with the organization of matter, but with the quality of human nature.

—WALTER LIPPMANN

UNDERSTANDING—THE "BRIDGE"

True discernment is an office of the human understanding. In and of itself it is a passive, though by no means a negative, quality. When this passive quality of the understanding becomes active, we discriminate. We discern by contrasts; we discriminate by choice or preference. Discernment belongs to the judgment of man as to qualities and things. Discrimination belongs to the will of man. It is an act of the will that anticipates results. To discern is to know; to discriminate is to do.

—William Q. Judge

Discrimination is a faculty, or power, whose range and value depend entirely upon the knowledge and understanding of the individual using it. All men use this faculty but in as many different degrees as exist between the densest ignorance and the highest wisdom. It may be called the ability to do the right thing, at the right time, and in the right place, on every plane of action. This necessitates a universal point of view, an understanding that covers the whole of nature, and a universal application of both.

—Robert Crosbie

THESE complementary quotations from William Q. Judge and Robert Crosbie direct attention to the importance of human understanding as a kind of "bridge" spanning the gap between the "densest ignorance" and the "highest wisdom." Universal intelligence includes both extremes, making possible rapport on all levels of experience. We speak of *putting ourselves* "in the place of another" as the only way to really know that other. Analogously, whatever the degree of intelligence or whatever plane it may be acting on, it may be *known* in the same manner.

The Preface to Patanjali's *Yoga Aphorisms* gives an extensive treatment of this idea. The term "knowledge" is used with greater meaning than is customarily given to it: "It implies full identification of the mind, for any length of time, with whatever object or subject it is directed to."

The mystery of Man is locked up in the mystery of Mind which, in incarnation, is dual: it fills the high office of discernment, and serves the multifarious needs of the senses. The reincarnating Ego —the permanent Individuality—is confused with "the body ac-

quired by Karma"—the personal, natural, animal-man. Between the two the gap is as wide as the abyss dividing the Divine and the demoniac; as deceptive as the rising and setting of the Sun. Consequently, "the path of action is obscure." The unitary nature of Mind must be realized.

The realm of human thought is bewilderingly filled with obstacles to this realization because of the identification of mind with a personality whose wants are mistaken for needs, which in turn become demands, drawing the energies of the mind toward concentration on externalities—magnified, advertised, glamorized. And life, which could be a rhythm of right intentions initiating a stream of meaningful sequences, becomes a mere madness of movement leaving literally "no time for anything" that calls for serious reflection. Ideas become crystallized on false values that fix unyielding limits within which the incarnating Ego is doomed to "live and move and have its being." Until, perhaps, some catastrophe strikes or illness befalls, or a heart-stirring loss is experienced, or some old ties from another lifetime, it may be, set the mind to thinking, looking within.

> Suppose in some life long-past I had a dear friend, or wife, or relative, with whom my intimacy was interior and deep. Death separates us, and in subsequent lives he devotes himself to truth, to wisdom, to the highest in him, while I go on careless of all but pleasure in the present. After many lives we meet again as either friends or acquaintances. At once the old intimacy asserts itself, and my former friend—although maybe neither of us knows it—has a strange power to touch my inward life, and wakes me up to search for truth and my own soul. It is the unexpended affinity, and by its aid nature works my salvation. (*Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita.*)

"The effect of affinities upon our acts and thoughts is enormous and wide. It anon saves us, and anon damns," wrote Mr. Judge. We learn from each other, and affect all life. Feelings of superiority, personal conceit, sectarianism, national pride—miscalled patriotism—and other vanities which separate man from his fellow-men stultify the mind which is the Soul's only channel for expression and experience. On the other hand, the power of empathy unites human beings and expands the Soul's field of experience. "To live and reap experience, the mind needs breadth and depth and points. . . ," says *The Voice of the Silence.*

The terms "Universal Brotherhood" and "Spiritual Identity" challenge the mind to think universally. The passive quality of the un-

derstanding becomes active; discrimination grows; and knowledge gained is not lost, but becomes the "medium of communication" between the Ego and the personal man—is, in fact, the "bridge," or *Antaskarana.* As explained in the *Theosophical Glossary*:

> The term has various meanings which differ with every school of philosophy and sect. Sankaracharya renders it as "understanding"; others, as "the internal instrument, the Soul, formed by the thinking principle and egoism"; whereas the Occultists explain it as the *path* or bridge between the Higher and the Lower Manas, the divine *Ego* and the *personal* Soul of man. It serves as a medium of communication between the two, and conveys from the Lower to the Higher Ego all those personal impressions and thoughts of men which can, by their nature, be assimilated and stored by the undying Entity, and be thus made immortal with it, these being the only elements of the evanescent *Personality* that survive death and time. It thus stands to reason that only that which is noble, spiritual and divine in man can testify in Eternity to his having lived.

ASSIMILATION IS ON BOTH SIDES OF DEATH.

SALVATION AS COMMITMENT

Salvation is not escape from life. The individual works in the cosmic process no longer as an obscure and limited ego, but as a centre of the divine or universal consciousness embracing and transforming into harmony all individual manifestations. It is to live in the world with one's inward being profoundly modified. The soul takes possession of itself and cannot be shaken from its tranquility by the attractions and attacks of the world. The spiritual illumination does not make the individual life impossible. If the saved individuals escape literally from the cosmic process, the world would be forever unredeemed. It would be condemned to remain for all time the scene of unending strife and darkness. . . . Mahayana Buddhism declares that Buddha standing on the threshold of *nirvana* took the vow never to make the irrevocable crossing so long as there was a single undelivered being on earth.

—S. RADHAKRISHNAN

THE BUDDHIST DOCTRINE

If we try, as Krishna directs, to find the divine in everything, we will soon learn not to judge by appearances.

—Wm. Q. Judge

WHEN we use the term Buddhists, we do not mean to imply by it either the exoteric Buddhism instituted by the followers of Gautama Buddha, or the modern Buddhistic religion, but the secret philosophy of Sakyamuni, which in its essence is certainly identical with the ancient Wisdom-Religion of the sanctuary, the pre-Vedic Brahmanism. Neither Buddha, Pythagoras, Orpheus, Socrates, nor even Jesus, left behind them any writings. The esoteric teachings of Buddha were the *Gupta Vidya* (secret knowledge) of the ancient Brahmins, the key to which their modern successors have, with few exceptions, completely lost. And this *Vidya* has passed into what is now known as the *inner* teachings of the *Mahayana* school of Northern Buddhism.

In fact, Buddhism in the present age, cannot be justly judged by one or the other of its *exoteric* popular forms. Real Buddhism can be appreciated only by blending the philosophy of the Southern Church and the metaphysics of the Northern Schools. If one seems too iconoclastic and stern, and the other too metaphysical and transcendental, even to being overgrown with the weeds of Indian exotericism—many of the gods of its Pantheon having been transplanted under new names to Tibetan soil—it is entirely due to the popular expression of Buddhism in both Churches. The Hindu Reformer limited his public teachings to the purely moral and physiological aspect of the Wisdom-Religion, to Ethics and MAN alone. Things "unseen and incorporeal," the mystery of Being outside our terrestrial sphere, the great Teacher left entirely untouched in his public lectures, reserving the hidden Truths for a select circle of his Arhats.

Time and imagination made short work of the purity and philosophy of these teachings, once that they were transplanted from the secret and sacred circle of the Arhats, during the course of their

Note.—A student's collation from theosophical teachings.

work of proselytism, into a soil less prepared for metaphysical conceptions than India; *i.e.,* once they were transferred into China, Japan, Siam, and Burma. How the pristine purity of these grand revelations was dealt with may be seen in studying some of the so-called "esoteric" Buddhist schools of antiquity in their modern garb, not only in China and other Buddhist countries in general, but even in not a few schools in Tibet, left to the care of uninitiated Lamas and Mongolian innovators.

One great distinction between Theosophy and exoteric Buddhism is that the latter, represented by the Southern Church [Theravada], entirely denies (*a*) the existence of any Deity, and (*b*) any conscious *post-mortem* life, or even any self-conscious surviving individuality in man. Such at least is the teaching of the Siamese sect, now considered as the *purest* form of exoteric Buddhism. And it is so, if we refer only to Buddha's public teachings. The schools of the Northern Buddhist Church, established in those countries to which his initiated Arhats retired after the Master's death, teach all that is now called Theosophical doctrines, because they form part of the knowledge of the initiates—thus proving how the truth has been sacrificed to the dead-letter by the too-zealous orthodoxy of Southern Buddhism. But how much grander and more noble, more philosophical and scientific, even in its dead-letter, is this teaching than that of any other Church or religion.

"The one Universal Light, which to Man is *Darkness,* is ever existent," says the Chaldean "Book of Numbers." From it proceeds periodically the ENERGY, which is reflected in the "Deep" or Chaos, the storehouse of future worlds, and, once awakened, stirs up and fructifies the latent Forces, which are the ever present eternal potentialities in it. Then awake anew the Brahmas and Buddhas—the co-eternal Forces—and a new Universe springs into being. . . . The doctrine of God being the Universal Mind diffused through all things, underlies all ancient philosophies. The Buddhistic tenets which can never be better comprehended than when studying Pythagorean philosophy—its faithful reflection—are derived from this source as well as the Brahmanical religion and early Christianity. Archaic Occultism would remain incomprehensible to all, if it were rendered otherwise than through the more familiar channels of Buddhism and Hinduism. For the former is the emanation of the latter; and both are the children of one mother—ancient *Lemuro-Atlantean Wisdom.*

It is by the spirit of the teachings of both Buddha and Pythagoras that we can so easily recognize the identity of their doctrines. The all-pervading universal soul, the *Anima Mundi,* is Nirvana; and Buddha, as a generic name, is the anthropomorphized *monad* of Pythagoras. When resting in Nirvana, the final bliss, Buddha is the silent MONAD, dwelling in *darkness and silence*. He is also the formless Brahm, the sublime but *unknowable* Deity, which pervades invisibly the whole Universe. Whenever It is manifested, desiring to impress itself upon humanity in a shape intelligent to our intellect, whether we call it an *avatar,* or a King Messiah, or a *permutation* of Divine Spirit, *Logos,* Christos, it is all one and the same thing. In each case it is "the Father," who is in the *Son,* and the Son in "the Father." The immortal spirit overshadows the mortal man. It enters into him, and pervading his whole being, makes of him a god, who descends into his earthly tabernacle. Every man may become a Buddha, says the doctrine.

In the esoteric, and even exoteric Buddhism of the North, Adi Buddha, the One unknown, without beginning or end, identical with Parabrahm and Ain-Soph, emits a bright ray from its darkness. This is the *Logos* (the first), or Vajradhara, the Supreme Buddha. As the Lord of all Mysteries he cannot manifest, but sends into the world of manifestation his heart—the "diamond heart," Vajrasattva. This is the second *logos* of creation, from whom emanate the seven Dhyani Buddhas, called the Anupadaka, "the parentless." These Buddhas are the primeval monads from the world of *incorporeal being,* the *Arupa* world, wherein the Intelligences (on that plane only) have neither shape nor name, in the exoteric system, but have their distinct seven names in esoteric philosophy. These Dhyani Buddhas emanate, or create from themselves, by virtue of Dhyana, celestial Selves—the *superhuman* Bodhisattvas. These incarnating at the beginning of every human cycle on earth as mortal men, become occasionally, owing to their personal merit, Bodhisattvas among the Sons of Humanity, after which they may re-appear as *Manushi* (human) Buddhas. The Anupadaka (or Dhyani Buddhas) are thus identical with the Brahmanical *Manasaputra,* "mind-born sons"—whether of Brahma or either of the other two Trimurtian Hypostases, hence identical also with the Rishis and Prajapatis.

As the reader is supposed not to be acquainted with the Dhyani-Buddhas, it is as well to say at once that, *according to the Orientalists,* there are five Dhyanis who are the "celestial" Buddhas, of whom

the human Buddhas are the manifestations in the world of form and matter. Esoterically, however, the Dhyani-Buddhas are seven, of whom five only have hitherto manifested, and two are to come in the sixth and seventh Root-races. They are, so to speak, the eternal prototypes of the Buddhas who appear on this earth, each of whom has his particular divine prototype. So, for instance, Amitabha is the Dhyani-Buddha of Gautama Sakyamuni, manifesting through him whenever this great Soul incarnates on earth as He did in Tzon-kha-pa [who was] the first and greatest Reformer who founded the "Yellow-Caps," Gyalugpas. He was born in the year 1355 A.D. in Amdo, and was the *Avatar* of Amitabha, the celestial name of Gautama Buddha.

The term Anupadaka, "parentless," or without progenitors, is a mystical designation having several meanings in the philosophy. By this name celestial beings, the Dhyan-Chohans or Dhyani-Buddhas, are generally meant. But as these correspond mystically to the human Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, known as the "Manushi (or human) Buddhas," the latter are also designated "Anupadaka," once that their whole personality is merged in their compound sixth and seventh principles—or Atma-Buddhi, and that they have become "diamond-souled" (Vajrasattvas), the full Mahatmas. The mystery in the hierarchy of the Anupadaka is great, its apex being the universal Spirit-Soul, and the lower rung the Manushi-Buddha; and even every Soul-endowed man is an Anupadaka in a latent state.

As the synthesis of the seven Dhyani-Buddhas, Avalokiteswara was the first Buddha (the Logos), so Amitabha is the inner "God" of Gautama, who, in China, is called Amita(-Buddha). They are, as Mr. Rhys Davids correctly states, "the glorious counterparts in the mystic world, free from the debasing conditions of this material life" of every earthly mortal Buddha—the liberated Manushi-Buddhas appointed to govern the Earth in this Round. They are the "Buddhas of Contemplation," and are all Anupadaka (parentless), i.e., self-born of divine essence. The exoteric teaching which says that every Dhyani-Buddha has the faculty of creating from himself, an equally celestial son—a Dhyani-Bodhisattva—who, after the decease of the Manushi (human) Buddha, has to carry out the work of the latter, rests on the fact that owing to the highest initiation performed by one overshadowed by the "Spirit of Buddha" a candidate becomes virtually a Bodhisattva, created such by the High Initiator.

As to Gautama's being one of the true and undeniable SAVIOURS of the World, suffice it to say that the most rabid orthodox missionary, unless he is hopelessly insane, or has not the least regard for historical truth, cannot find one smallest accusation against the life and personal character of the "Buddha." Without any claim to divinity, allowing his followers to fall into atheism rather than into the degrading superstition of deva or idol-worship, his walk in life is from the beginning to the end, holy and divine. During the forty-five years of his mission, it is as blameless and pure as that of a god —or as the latter should be. He is a perfect example of a divine, godly man. He reached Buddhaship—*i.e.,* complete enlightenment —entirely by his own merit and owing to his own individual exertions, no god being supposed to have any *personal* merit in the exercise of goodness and holiness. His is the only absolutely *bloodless* religion among all the existing religions: tolerant and liberal, teaching universal compassion and charity, love and self-sacrifice, poverty and contentment with one's lot, whatever it may be. No persecutions, and enforcement of faith by fire and sword, have ever disgraced it. No thunder-and-lightning-vomiting god has interfered with its chaste commandments; and if the simple, human philosophical code of daily life left to us by the greatest Man-Reformer ever known, should ever come to be adopted by mankind at large, then indeed an era of bliss and peace would dawn on humanity.

To become a Buddha one has to reach a complete detachment from all that is evanescent and finite, and live while yet on Earth in the immortal and everlasting alone, in a supreme state of holiness. To become a Buddha one has to break through the bondage of sense and personality; to acquire a complete perception of the REAL SELF and learn not to separate it from all other selves; to learn by experience the utter unreality of all phenomena of the visible Kosmos foremost of all. When the spiritual *entity* breaks loose for ever from every particle of matter, then only it enters upon the eternal and unchanging Nirvana. He exists in spirit, in *nothing;* as a form, a shape, a semblance, he is completely *annihilated,* and thus will die no more, for spirit alone is no *Maya,* but the only REALITY in an illusionary universe of ever-passing forms. Esoteric teachings claim that Buddha renounced Nirvana and gave up the Dharmakaya vesture to remain a "Buddha of Compassion" within the reach of the miseries of this world. And the religious philosophy he left to it has produced for over 2,000 years generations of good and unselfish men.

Every Orientalist and Pundit knows by heart the story of Gautama, the Buddha, the most perfect of mortal men that the world has ever seen, but none of them seem to suspect the esoteric meaning underlying his *prenatal* biography, *i.e.,* the significance of the popular story. The *Lalitavistara* tells the tale, but abstains from hinting at the truth. The 5,000 *Jatakas,* or the events of former births (re-incarnations) are taken literally instead of esoterically. Gautama, the Buddha, would not have been a mortal man, had he not passed through hundreds and thousands of births previous to his last. Yet the detailed account of these, and the statement that during them he worked his way up through every stage of transmigration from the lowest animate and inanimate atom and insect, up to the highest—or *man,*—contains simply the well-known occult aphorism, "a stone becomes a plant, a plant an animal, and an animal a man." Every human being who has ever existed has passed through the same evolution. But the hidden symbolism in the sequence of these re-births (*jatakas*) contains a perfect history of the evolution on this earth, *pre* and *post* human, and is a scientific exposition of natural facts. One truth not veiled but bare and open is found in their nomenclature, *viz.,* that as soon as Gautama had reached the human form he began exhibiting in every personality the utmost unselfishness, self-sacrifice and charity. The name "Gautama" means—"on earth (gau) the most victorious (tama)."

The ethics of Theosophy are identical with those taught by Buddha, being the soul of the Wisdom-Religion, and once the common property of the initiates of all nations. But Buddha was the first to embody these lofty ethics in his public teachings, and to make them the foundation and the very essence of his public system. It is herein that lies the immense difference between the exoteric Buddhism and every other religion. For while in other religions ritualism and dogma hold the first and most important place, in Buddhism it is the ethics which have always been the most insisted upon. Christianity becomes every day more a religion of pure emotionalism; the root philosophy of both Adwaita and Buddhist scholars is *identical,* and both have the same respect for animal life, for both believe that every creature on earth, however small and humble, "is an immortal portion of the immortal matter"—for matter with them has quite another significance than it has with either Christian or materialist—and that every creature is subject to Karma.

YOUTH FORUM

War either exists or is imminent throughout the world. With it comes a need to re-examine the "justice" involved in sacrificing innocent civilians as well as "soldiers" to some secure future. Is it not naïve to think that we can understand what "justice" means in any of these deaths? For example, to tell a man whose wife and children have been killed that their fate is ultimately justified by Karma is surely inadequate, even if in some sense true. The "justice" here seems so far removed from ordinary understanding that it demands a faith in a "law of compensation" which is difficult for most people to accept. Is Theosophy asking us to sacrifice moral sensitivity for an abstract "rigid Justice" which "rules the world"? Everything human in us cries out for a more substantial explanation.

Because the theosophical ideas on "cause-and-effect" are often oversimplified, it is important to clarify the *philosophical* idea of justice. The justification asked for above is not one to which a man may point by referring to specifics and say, *"This* is the explanation of these violations against human life"; nor is it a question which wants the rationalization of strategists, military advisors, or diplomats who have a vested interest in winning another "just war." The questioner's rhetoric reflects the defeat of all opponents involved in war. There are no victors here, because the lesson learned by families decimated by bombs is hardly a lesson, even for the dead. For the living, the loss of family, relatives, and friends is a complete tragedy; yet one must attempt to understand such evil and give it dimension in some kind of human terms. Once we make this attempt, we are in the position of Dostoevsky's Ivan, who, in *The Brothers Karamazov,* says:

> With my pitiful, earthly, Euclidian understanding, all I know is that there is suffering and that there are none guilty; that cause follows effect, simply and directly that everything flows and finds its level—but that's only Euclidian nonsense, I know that, and I can't consent to live by it! What comfort is it to me that there are none guilty and that cause follows effect simply and directly, and that I know it—I must have Justice, or I will destroy myself.

Yes, Justice! we may rejoin, before we are bound to some moral compromise by the subtlety and complexity of our attempts to explain cause and effect. Many men long for Ivan's justice. But when applied to the expediencies of immediate conditions and decisions, that "justice" is often distorted to fit specious argument. In another passage, Ivan questions the means used to achieve idealistic ends:

> Imagine that you are creating a fabric of human destiny with the object of making men happy in the end, giving them peace and rest at last, but that it was essential and inevitable to torture to death only one tiny [child] . . . and to found that edifice on its unavenged tears, would you consent to be the architect on those conditions?
>
> And can you admit the idea that men for whom you are building it would agree to accept their happiness on the foundation of the unexpiated blood of a little victim? And accepting it would remain happy for ever?

Dostoevsky would not allow suffering to be explained away by a "simple and direct" cause and effect. He confronts us with our shallow personal oversimplifications; at the same time he makes the confusions and contradictions of violent revolutionary movements stand in relief. Both the individual and the modern state are put on trial by Dostoevsky's question (which is really a powerful moral affirmation). For every modern ideology which gains its authority through force of arms must account for many "unavenged tears."

The harmony—the peace and freedom—expounded by powerful governments depends upon the manipulation and coercion of large segments of its population. How else can you maintain a standing army or the moral incentive which will arouse millions of people against an "enemy"? Compromise of principle in behalf of the future is justified by appealing to the average citizen's provincialisms regarding virtues and vices, loves and hates.

It may be too much to expect an impartial hearing before the tribunal of the modern state, whose "individual" citizen is but one unit of a composite statistic. There are no truly unique citizens here; there is only an amorphous cultural vision of the Good of Man in terms of the gross national profit, political behavior, and economic affluence. In this view, it is considered inevitable that many will have to sacrifice their lives for that "fabric of human destiny with the object of making men happy in the end."

All this has answered nothing for us. Maybe there *is* no exact an-

swer—because what we want is some greater understanding of the "order" which guides life and death, a karma which is plottable. Obviously the "state" cannot explain or assume the responsibility for that order; it cannot redress the results of irresponsible human behavior. It can only make some gross material adjustment, while the real compensation must come from the inner sense of the fitness of things from both the violators and the violated. We can take as a guide a statement of Mr. Judge's that Karma "is therefore a question, not alone of desert and similarity, but one of responsibility." There is both paradox and mystery involved in this statement because a person *is* the Karma he is trying to understand. When he *assumes* responsibility for his actions, it means that he intends to participate in the results of those acts. The normal cause-effect relationship is then set against a different perspective: instead of saying, "I did that, therefore *this happened* to me," he will say, "I did that, therefore I *must do* this." Such a stance transcends causes and effects; experience becomes, not a collection of "happenings," but rather a series of new beginnings.

We have not explained "theosophical justice" as asked in the original question. Indeed, it is doubtful whether we can map the subtle trail of causes which led to a particular effect. But this is not really the problem. The problem is more a matter of how we will think and act when we are directly touched by suffering and death in the world.

CONTINUUM FOR "JUSTICE"

The prospect of many such lives as ours has a bright as well as a dark aspect. Not only is there good in all the pre-final stages as well as evil, but those stages, the evil as well as the good, serve for the development of our nature. Such life as ours now, in which sin jostles with virtue, and doubt with confidence, and hatred with love, cannot satisfy us, but it can teach us a great deal—far more then can be learned between a single birth and a single death.

—JOHN MCTAGGART

on the lookout

"Science Pauses"

An article with this title in the May *Fortune,* by Dr. Vannevar Bush, honorary Board Chairman of M.I.T. and developer of the Bush Differential Analyzer (grandfather of modern computers), sets the stage for what may become another "rent in the veil of matter." Candidly appraising the role of science, Dr. Bush attempts to clarify a general misconception:

> This is the misconception that scientists can establish a complete set of facts and relations about the universe, all neatly proved, and that on this firm basis men can securely establish their personal philosophy, their personal religion, free from doubt or error. Much is spoken today about the power of science, and rightly. It is awesome. But little is said about the inherent limitations of science, and both sides of the coin need equal scrutiny.

The chief concern of this eminent writer is that a too-firm reliance on physical science as an effective means of solving our problems and explaining the universe has led "to a philosophy of materialism, and an especially unattractive form of it."

A Description of Oversimplification

Dr. Bush describes the philosophy of materialism in these terms:

> Soon man would be able to understand all of nature, this philosophy ran. Everything would be controlled by a neat set of equations. Merely by observing the present state of things, one could predict all the future. All the history of the universe, all of man's part in it, was, so it seemed, controlled by causal, mechanistic laws. Man was merely an automaton. His fancied choice of acts was an illusion; he merely carried out what was inevitable in the light of his nature and nurture. Pride of intellect never went further.
>
> The extremes of materialism that flowed from these beginnings did not touch the mass of men. But later there came an upheaval that wrenched even the common man loose from his moorings. . . . the man in the street was suddenly confronted with the assertion that he was descended from an ape. Worse was to come: it soon appeared that princes and people alike were

> even descended from a bacterium. Mythology came apart, and the question of the spontaneous origin of life was fiercely debated. If all living things had descended from some minute organism in a primeval soupy sea, did that organism itself appear by the chance joining of chemical constituents in that complex environment?

While Dr. Bush feels confident that man will some day succeed in creating organic "life" through laboratory experiment, he feels that science has nothing to say on the most vital questions concerning man; nor does it even produce evidence. It is a hopeful sign to find such scientists as Dr. Bush defining the proper limits of inquiry in physical science.

It Is Earlier than They Think

The destructive effects of materialism are apparent throughout the structure of our society and need no elaboration here. Dr. Bush recognizes this, and feels that warning should be given to young people who appear to embrace a materialistic view of life with enthusiasm. He puts it this way:

> Science leads, more often than not, to a rigid atheism. Under whatever name or state they go, there is cause for much concern over those who follow science blindly, or relapse into a hopeless pessimism. It is earlier than they think. . . . Young men, who will formulate the deep thought of the next generation, should lean on science, for it can teach much and it can inspire. But they should not lean where it does not apply.

Mysteries of Consciousness

Tracing the evolution of the physical sciences from the time of Galileo, and the "logical" implications of conceiving the universe in physical terms, the fact remains there is still no accepted definition of "life." Although the genes, the self-duplicating nucleic acids, appear to be the key to all heredity and the physical development of the organism, Dr. Bush observes:

> There is some question whether all this is sufficient to explain, for example, the linkages in the brain of a spider by which it knows how to spin a web without being taught, so we may be taking only the first step on a very long road.

Our knowledge of the growth and development of the physical universe through simple material processes seems complete, except, Dr. Bush indicates, for one thing:

> Man is conscious of his existence. Man also possesses, so most of us believe, what he calls his free will. Did consciousness and free will too arise merely out of "natural" processes? The question is central to the contention between those who see nothing beyond a new materialism and those who see—Something.

The Wall

Since *The Secret Doctrine* was published in the last century, 77 years have elapsed. At that time H.P.B. indicated that physical science had not only come to a pause, but had come up against a wall beyond which it could not go unless "scepticism and our present natural ignorance are equilibrated by intuition and a natural spirituality." (*S.D.* I, 480.) She set the limits of physical science as follows:

> Physical science is welcome to speculate upon the physiological mechanism of living beings, and to continue her fruitless efforts in trying to resolve our feelings, our sensations, mental and spiritual, into functions of their inorganic vehicles. Nevertheless, all that will ever be accomplished in this direction has already been done, and science will go no farther. She is before a dead wall, on the face of which she traces, as she imagines, great physiological and psychic discoveries, but every one of which will be shown later on to be no better than the cobwebs spun by her scientific fancies and illusions. The tissues of our objective framework alone are subservient to the analysis and researches of physiological science. The six higher principles in them will evade forever the hand that is guided by an animus that purposely ignores and rejects the Occult Sciences. (*S.D.* I, 134.)

The Role of Science Defined

Although Dr. Bush provides no clue to the direction philosophy and psychology should take in endeavoring to transcend the bonds of materialistic thinking, he clearly defines the limits of physicalist logic:

> Logic can proceed only when the entities with which it is concerned are strictly defined. Science can proceed only when it can observe with precision, and when it can measure. [Yet] we have no evidence that three dimensions are all that exist. Perhaps we observe merely a three-dimensional cross-section of a four-dimensional universe.

Or, in more detail, perhaps a seven-dimensional universe. Speaking to this point, *The Secret Doctrine* suggests:

> Now that they (the scientists) have studied nature in the length, breadth, and thickness of her physical frame, it is time

> to remove the skeleton to the second plane and search within the unknown depths for the living and real entity, for its Substance—the noumenon of evanescent matter. (*S.D.* I, 610.)

Scientific Inquiry—A Freer Atmosphere

However, "faulty, materialistic, and biassed as the scientific theories may be, they are a thousand times nearer the truth than the vagaries of theology," says H.P.B. (*S.D.* I, 323). Dr. Bush's remarks demonstrate that the "truth searching" attitude of the dedicated scientist can ultimately counteract materialist bias:

> Science has come a long way in delineating the probable nature of the universe that surrounds us, of the physical world in which we live, of our own structure, our physical and chemical nature. It even enters into the mechanism by which the brain itself operates. Then it comes to the questions of consciousness and free will—and there it stops. No longer can science prove, or even bear evidence.

While this may be a useful evaluation of the limits of scientific inquiry, H.P.B. indicates the further reach of metaphysics:

> It is impossible to conceive anything without a cause; the attempt to do so makes the mind a blank. This is virtually the condition to which the mind must come at last when we try to trace back the chain of causes and effects, but both science and religion jump to this condition of blankness much more quickly than is necessary; for they ignore the metaphysical abstractions which are the only conceivable cause of physical concretions. (*S.D.* I, 44,45.)

The End of an Era

A parish pamphlet for March (Tadworth, England) reprints from *The Church of the World* (a publication of the British Council of Churches) a B.B.C. report of a most unusual conference of European Churches. The conference took place from October 5 to 9, 1964, and was the fourth such meeting. Delegates included not only the official representatives of the churches of western Europe but also those from all "iron-curtain" countries. The previous three meetings had been held in Denmark, but owing to political complications, the fourth conference was held aboard a small ship moored in the Kattegat, a channel between Denmark and Sweden. B.B.C. commentator Kenneth Slack had this to report:

> Most of the speakers were in chastening mood. There are vast differences between the church situations on the two sides of the

great political divide; but there's one enormous thing they have in common. Their position of built-in power and privilege is virtually over everywhere. Vestiges of it—even substantial vestiges—may remain in some western countries. They can't disguise . . . the fact that the old accepted Christian order is over. Again and again the summons was sounded at our floating conference to face up to this. Dr. Visser 't Hooft, the general secretary of the World Council of Churches, said it most bluntly: "The Churches have not yet faced this situation. They are still largely concerned with conserving the remains of the old Christian culture. . . . There is a nostalgia for the old Christian Europe. But the finale of the symphony between Christianity and European culture is being played. . . . The Churches in this situation must give up any remaining dreams of privilege and power."

Or a Transformation?

Mr. Slack continues:

> The old placid assumptions of European superiority were "out" in our relations to other continents. The old unconscious exertion of authority by the older generation over the younger was at an end. A more difficult but deeper and more human relationship was demanded. In the words of the title of one of the most disturbing Christian books of our day there was "Naught for our Comfort." Or nothing in the way of easy comfort. We could at least take heart from the fact that we wanted to "live together" and look at this revolution together. The lengths to which we were prepared to go to do just that were symbolized by our ship-board meeting.

Many Theosophists are still not fully aware of the depth and extent of the trend within Christianity toward "re-thinking religion"—especially in respect to mind-stultifying partisanships. The ecumenical emphasis has forced churchmen of all denominations to scrutinize their particular dogmas and challenge arbitrary assumptions. A review of isms on this subject in Lookout during the past year or so will show several lines along which various denominations have advanced toward the position H.P.B. indicated as *necessary* in her series "The Esoteric Character of the Gospels":

> The twentieth century has strange developments in store for humanity, and may even be the last of its name. But I may briefly repeat a prophecy which is a self-evident result of the present state of men's minds in Christendom. Belief in the Bible *literally*, and in a *carnalised* Christ, will not last a quarter of a century longer. The Churches will have to part with their cherished dogmas, or the 20th century will witness the downfall and ruin of all Christendom, and with it, belief even in a Christos, as pure Spirit. The very name has now become obnoxious, and

theological Christianity must die out, *never to resurrect again* in its present form. . . . (THEOSOPHY 39:218-9.)

"No Longer a Christian Society"

The passage continues:

> This, in itself, would be the happiest solution of all, were there no danger from the natural reaction which is sure to follow: crass materialism will be the consequence and the result of centuries of blind faith, unless the loss of old ideals is replaced by other ideals, unassailable, because *universal*. . . . (*Loc. cit.*)

One of Paul Goodman's essays is relevant in this context—"Post-Christian Man" (*Utopian Essays and Practical Proposals,* Vintage Books, 1964). Mr. Goodman begins by saying: "It is evident that the Americans are no longer a Christian society in any important sense. Their dogmas, tinged with superstition, are scientific; their ethics, rapidly changing, are the product of economic and urban institutions that are already only distantly related to Christian ideas. We are Post-Christian men." Mr. Goodman then discusses several articles of belief originally identified with Christianity but which have now "so strongly and universally established themselves in our culture that there is no point in attributing them to a special group of believers . . . and indeed they have come to look strangely un-Christian." This change has come about through the permeation of attitudes which the Christianity of the churches has bequeathed in terms of conformity to authority and concessions to "group" demands—an influence which now manifests as the antithesis of Christ's original teachings. Here section 3 of the essay, dealing with socialization, seems especially applicable:

> Mankind seems to be galloping toward the condition of a social beehive or termitary, in which individual uniqueness, creaturely contact, neighborly charity, the satisfactions of local community, and the high culture of real cities, are all increasingly irrelevant. In this process the tendencies of Christianity have certainly been influential. A conformist and universal population, working to keep running a busy economic machine, and controlled by an abstract and normative science: this is socialized human nature. . . .
>
> Whether man *can* be essentially socialized or not, forming almost a new species from anything we have known, is a question for future history. If essential socialization is impossible, what will become of our present gallop toward such an absurd state? There seem to be two alternatives: either the unbearable heightening of anxiety, total apathy and anomie, and catastrophic vio-

lence; or the revolt of nature, existential disgust, conflict, and new religion.

Later, Mr. Goodman comments: "The present failure of millenarian nerve is an irrefutable proof that Christianity has ceased to exist as a living world faith."

Frequent references to the writings of Abraham Maslow, Brandeis University psychologist and president of the New England Psychological Association, have indicated an approach to both psychology and religion of clear theosophical orientation. Dr. Maslow's latest book, *Religions, Values, and Peak-Experiences* (Ohio State University Press, 1964), makes this association particularly clear in a chapter concerned with "man's higher nature":

> We can see more clearly today than ever before that one important characteristic of the new "third" psychology is its demonstration of man's "higher nature." As we look back through the religious conceptions of human nature—and indeed we need not look back so very far because the same doctrine can be found in Freud—it becomes crystal clear that any doctrine of the innate depravity of man or any maligning of his animal nature very easily leads to some extra-human interpretation of goodness, saintliness, virtue, self-sacrifice, altruism, etc. If they can't be explained from within human nature—and explained they must be—then they must be explained from outside of human nature. The worse man is, the poorer a thing he is conceived to be, the more necessary becomes a god. It can also be understood more clearly now that one source of the decay of belief in supernatural sanctions has been increasing faith in the higher possibilities of human nature.

Crime Against Nature

In an article titled "Wild Life Under Siege" (*Scientific American*, August, 1964), Joseph A. Davis, Jr., points up some wide-ranging effects of what H. P. Blavatsky called the "genius of destruction—civilization":

> Although natural forces continue to act upon the fauna and flora of the world and must inevitably doom some species to extinction, the technology and sheer number of humans . . . has in many ways precluded nature's long-term effects. In the past few years, however, it has become clear that the foreseeable future holds the awful promise of certain doom on a wholesale scale for the plants and animals of entire regions. Worse, region after region will be added to the list, like pieces of a vast planet-wide jigsaw puzzle, and when at last the picture emerges it will be one of desolation, not alone for the plants and animals of the world,

> but for ourselves as well, for only recently have we begun to suspect the extent to which all living things are interdependent.

"Public awareness," Mr. Davis suggests, "appears to be the only hope today for averting the otherwise irreversible process." While newspapers and magazines have given "an increasing amount of publicity to the subject from various avenues of approach, . . . a true understanding of the crisis that is upon us has as yet to impress itself upon more than the few ecologists who are working in the field." These inconsistencies reflect both the sensitivity and the frustration of conservationists who are desperately trying to stop the destruction of our natural environment.

Two Viewpoints on "Biology"

In *The Great Chain of Life,* Joseph Wood Krutch points out that the technical-physical approach to the study of biology tends to make men unaware of the interdependence between all life and beings. Mr. Krutch says that when animals and plants are forever dissected and analyzed, "biology not only fails to promote reverence for life but encourages the tendency to blaspheme it." He adds: "Instead of increasing empathy it destroys it. Instead of enlarging our sympathy it hardens the heart." He continues:

> The grand question remains whether most people actually *want* hearts to be tenderer or harder. Do we want a civilization that will move toward some more intimate relation with the natural world, or do we want one that will continue to detach and isolate itself from both a dependence upon and a sympathy with that community of which we were originally a part? Do we want a physical environment more and more exclusively man-made and an intellectual, emotional, and aesthetic life which has renounced as completely as possible its interest in everything inherited from the long centuries during which we were, willy-nilly, dependent upon what the natural world supplied? Do we want cities completely sterilized and mechanized; do we want art that imitates exclusively the man-made rather than the natural?

ULT LIBRARY
BANGALORE.
Accn. No 92

Bound by
SAMA BROS.
360, 42nd Cross, 8th Block
Jayanagar, Bangalore-560 041